

### **REMARKS**

Claims 20, 25-28 have been cancelled. Claims 21, 29, and 30 are pending. Claim 31 has been added. Applicants submit that the amendments are not new matter and are fully supported by the specification. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested. Furthermore these amendments are made in response to an interview with the Examiner in which the Examiner indicated that these Amendments would put the claims in condition for Allowance.

### **Examiner Interview**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for her time and consideration during the interview, in which the Examiner indicated claim 21 is allowable. All other claims have been amended to comport with this indication.

### **Priority**

A statement of priority reflects the prior application of which this is a continuation.

### **35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

In the Office Action mailed April 8, 2003 the Examiner Rejected claims 20, 21, 24, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for being indefinite and failing to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the Applicant regards as his invention. The Examiner also rejected claim 20 and the claims dependant thereon (claims 21, 24, 29, and 30) as being unclear. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, to expedite prosecution of this application, and in accordance with the Examiner interview, the Applicants have amended the claims in a manner which the Applicants believe put the claims in condition for allowance.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) Anticipation**

Examiner rejected claims 20, 24, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Trojanowski. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, to expedite prosecution of this application, and in accordance with the Examiner interview, the Applicants have amended the claims in a manner which the Applicants believe put the claims in condition for allowance.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Obviousness**

The Examiner has rejected claim 20, 24, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable Lee et al. in view of Goding. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, to expedite prosecution of this application, and in accordance with the Examiner interview, the Applicants have amended the claims in a manner which the Applicants believe put the claims in condition for allowance. Furthermore, the articles not made of record previously are included in the 1449.

### **New Rejections**

#### **35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph.**

The Examiners rejected claims 20, 21, 24, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph for lack of enablement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However the Applicant has amended the claims in the manner, which places the claims in condition of allowance.

### **Double Patenting**

A terminal disclaimer accompanies this response, which Applicants believe overcomes the rejection based upon double patenting. The disclaimers are made to expedite issuance and are not intended as an admission that any claim of the claimed invention is the same or an obvious variation of those of U.S. Patent No. 6,121,003.

#### **35 U.S.C. §. 103 Obviousness**


The Examiner rejected claim 29 as being unpatentable over Trojanowski et al and in further view of Dickson et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, to expedite prosecution of this application, and in accordance with the Examiner interview, the Applicants have amended the claim in a manner, which the Applicants believe, put the claims in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P. C  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 766-6045

Date: 8-8-03

By   
Rebecca A. Bortolotti  
Reg. No. 51,488  
RAB:rlr